

REMARKS

The FINAL Office Action of February 21, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3-6, 9-14, 16-18, and 21-26 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 11, and 21 are independent claims. A listing of the claims is reproduced herein without amendment for the convenience of the Examiner.

1. Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

The Office Action, beginning on page 2, rejects claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11-14, 16-18, and 21-26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,122,647 (hereinafter referred to as Horowitz '647) in view of Horowitz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,236,987 (hereinafter referred to as Horowitz '987), and Reber et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,986,651 (hereinafter referred to as Reber). Further, the Office Action, beginning on page 8, rejects claim 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz '647 in view of Horowitz '987, and Reber as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Keith Jr., U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0032672 (hereinafter referred to as Keith). Applicant respectfully traverses the forgoing rejections and respectfully requests reconsideration for the following reasons.

Horowitz '647 discloses a method for creating contextual hyperlinks in a source document, where the hyperlinks associate the source document with available target documents. The method includes selecting terms relevant to the user through linguistic analysis, from which relevant target documents are identified. A tagging module receives user selected portions of a document and selects terms to be used for establishing contextual links. A presentation module identifies topics in the knowledge base associated with the selected terms, and creates hyperlinks between the terms in the source document and target documents. (See Horowitz '647 Abstract.)

Horowitz '987 discloses an information retrieval system and method that dynamically organizes content retrieved in response to user input queries. The system operates on a document collection, in which each document is associated with one or more topics that have arbitrary semantic relationships with each other. In response to a query which may include topic terms, an initial set of documents is

selected from the document collection. The documents in the initial set are organized by the topic arrangement, which organization may then be used to narrow or broaden the initial query. Four types of topic arrangements are possible – supertopics (has topics that are associated with all of the documents of the current document set), subtopics (has a selection of topics that provide the best coverage over the current document set), perspective topics (selects topics other than query topics), and theme topics (expresses a subject or a concept describing the document set). (See Horowitz '987 col. 2, line 65 to col. 7, line 34.)

Reber discloses a network navigation device which includes machine-readable data with an instruction for linking to a resource in an electronic network (see Reber Abstract). The machine readable data can include instructions which direct a network access apparatus to execute any combination of: a predetermined client routine (e.g., a predetermined Internet browser routine), a predetermined network provider access routine (e.g., a dialing and logging on to a predetermined service provider), and navigation instructions for automatically linking the network access apparatus to an electronic address via an electronic network (see Reber column 4, line 61 to column 5 line 2).

Keith discloses a method for performing a search of a database to generate matching items in the database, where a matching item representing a node within a directory tree structure is formatted into an encyclopedia-like entry (see Keith paragraph 0022, on page 3). More specifically, Keith describes coupling a notification module to a saved search module to notify users that desired information that has been added to a searchable database (see Keith paragraph 0083, on page 9). As an example, announcements related to a particular model of car are pushed by the notification module to car dealerships that would like to receive that information as it is added to the searchable database (see Keith paragraph 0095, on page 11).

In contrast, Applicant's claimed invention recited concerns a method for enriching document content. The method, which is described in Applicant's specification in paragraphs 0156-0180, includes recording with a reader a personality identifier, together with context information relating to when and where the personality identifier is recorded. Further, the claimed method provides that the personality identifier is associated with a personality in a database of personalities. In addition, the claimed method provides that document content identified using the

recorded context information and metadata is enriched with the associated personality that defines a set of document service requests identifying enrichment themes.

More specifically, the Office Action asserts on page 4, first paragraph, (and further on pages 9-10, section 5) that with respect to Applicant's independent claim 1 Reber teaches the following:

Reber discloses a network navigation device from which electronic identification data may be read, which includes a transmitter and receiver (See Reber, Column 4, lines 45-60, Figure 3, element 56, and Column 7, lines 59-63). Reber also discloses recording context information including a time of year during which data is recorded by the reader (See Reber, Column 14, lines 60-67, Column 15, lines 1-8, and Column 16, lines 29-35). Reber also discloses recording position information, such as the location of machine-readable data in relation to the substrate (i.e. the location within the header or footer of the page)(See Reber, Column 15, lines 52-62, Column 16, lines 29-36, Figure 14, Column 14, lines 60-67, and Column 15, lines 1-2). [Emphasis Added]

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the application of Reber to the recited elements of the claimed invention asserted in the forgoing passage of the Office Action. Instead, the recited passages of Reber concerns the production of a network navigation device that is produced on a sheet of material such as paper (see Reber column 15, lines 49-51). The allegedly recorded context and position information fails to occur when a personality identifier is recorded by a reader, as claimed by Applicant (i.e., recording context information *with the reader when the personality identifier is recorded*; the recorded context information recorded with the reader including time information and position information, which time information includes information identifying *when the personality identifier is recorded with the reader* and which position information includes information identifying *where the personality identifier is recorded with the reader*, as claimed by Applicant).

More specifically, Reber discloses on column 15, lines 3-8, that "additional information can also be printed in the header 194 and the footer 196 of the sheet 188 [which can include a human-viewable form of] a date 202 and a time (not illustrated)

at which the resource was visited or the hardcopy output was printed” (see also Reber, reference numbers 194, 196 and 202 in Figure 14). As set forth in column 5, lines 35-38, a date and time may be included on hardcopy representations, such as a map, when a resource is visited, as set forth in column 15, lines 7-8. In contrast, Applicant’s claimed invention concerns the recording of time information when a personality identifier is recorded with a reader from an identification tag. That is, Reber in the cited section concerns *the recording of time on hardcopy representations of visited resources*, whereas Applicant’s claimed invention concerns *the recording of time when a personality identifier is recorded from an identification tag*.

In addition, the Office Action asserts on page 4, second paragraph, (and further on pages 9-10, section 5) that with respect to Applicant’s independent claim 1 Reber teaches the following:

Reber also discloses identifying document content within the reader using the recorded context information (See Reber, Column 7, lines 59-63), and transmitting from the reader the identified document content to a server (See Reber, Column 13, lines 34-50). [Emphasis Added]

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the application of Reber to the recited elements of the claimed invention asserted in the forgoing passage of the Office Action (i.e., Applicant’s claimed element of identifying document content with a reader *based on when and where (i) the personality identifier is recorded with the reader (from an identification tag) and (ii) document content is accessed with the reader*). Instead, the recited passages of Reber (i.e., Column 7, lines 59-63) concerns the use of a network navigation device (produced on a sheet of material such as paper) that identifies document content based on a URL. Thus, Reber in the cited sections neither discloses nor suggests identifying document content based on when and where a personality identifier is recorded with a reader and document content is accessed with a reader, as claimed by Applicant.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Horowitz ’987 (which discloses that results from queries may be organized by a topic arrangement, as discussed above) and/or Horowitz ’647 (which discloses a method for creating contextual links, as discussed above) taken in combination with Reber fail to disclose or suggest

using recorded context information (both time and position) as recited in independent claim 1, which recites that document content is identified *based on when and where* (i) a *personality identifier is recorded with the reader (from an identification tag)* and (ii) *document content is accessed with the reader*.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Horowitz '987 taken singly or in combination with Horowitz '647, and/or Reber fail to disclose or suggest using recorded context information as claimed by Applicant in independent claim 1. Insofar as independent claims 11 and 21 are concerned, these claims are believed to be allowable for those reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 as these claims contain the same or very similar limitations to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Insofar as claims 3-6, 9-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 22-26 are concerned, these claims depend from one of now presumably allowable independent claims 1, 11 and 21 and are also believed to be in allowable condition.

2. Fee Authorization And Extension Of Time

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment or response, however, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

3. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of this application and allowance thereof are earnestly solicited. In the event the Examiner considers a personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is hereby requested to call Attorney for Applicant(s), Thomas Zell.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas Zell #37481/

Thomas Zell

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Registration No. 37,481

Telephone: 650-812-4281

Date: April 23, 2007